

**REMARKS**

This Amendment responds to the Office Action of May 21, 2007. Claims 91-133, are pending in this application. Claims 1-90 have been previously canceled. Claims 91, 99, and 130 are independent. Claims 91, 93, 95, 98, 99, 103, 104, 108, 109, 113, 114, 115, 118, 119, 123, 124, and 130 are currently amended. The amendments are supported by the specification.

The specification also has been amended to add the previously made priority claim to U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/122,208 filed March 1, 1999. This amendment is proper because the priority claim was made in the Declaration when the application was filed, but was not included in the specification. It is also proper because this application was filed prior to November 29, 2000, and therefore the time limits of 37 C.F.R. § 1.78(a) do not apply.

In the Office Action, Claims 91-92 and 97 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minton (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,643), Fraser (U.S. Patent No. 5,904,974), and Beaudin (U.S. Patent No. 5,050,933), in view of Silverman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,136,501). Claims 93-96 and 98 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minton, Fraser, Beuadin et al., and Silverman et al., in further view of Dinwoodie (U.S. Patent No. 6,415,269). Claims 99-119, 121-130 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minton and Fraser, in further view of Beuadin et al. Claims 120 and 131-133 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Minton, Fraser, Beaudin, et al., Silverman et al., and Dinwoodie et al., in further view of Kane (U.S. Patent No. 6,317,728).

Applicants thank the Examiner for conducting a telephonic interview on October 3, 2007. Applicants also thank the Examiner and her supervisor for conducting an additional telephonic interview on November 2, 2007.

During the interviews, Applicants' representatives discussed the pending claims and how they overcame the prior art of record, including specifically the prior art cited in the Office Action. Applicants' representatives also discussed the amendments made herein. These amendments were made to improve the form of the claims and not to overcome the combination of references cited in the May 21, 2007 Office Action. The Examiner agreed that the pending claims as currently amended herein overcome the rejections based on the combinations of references relied upon in the May 21, 2007 Office Action.

**CONCLUSION**


In light of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 91-133 are patentably distinct over the prior art of record, that the application is in proper form for allowance of all claims, and earnestly solicit a notice to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

PROSKAUER ROSE LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

Date: November 19, 2007

PROSKAUER ROSE LLP  
1585 Broadway  
New York, NY 10036-8299  
Telephone: (212) 969-3000

By   
John C. Stellabotte  
Reg. No. 47,969